

CHRISTIANITY and CRISIS

A Christian Journal of Opinion

Straits That Are Desperate

A good deal of the criticism thrown at the Eisenhower-Dulles handling of China questions runs close to mere negation. Rather than face the risk that newer weapons might be used, we are urged not to irritate the Communists by defending any territory or government which they want to take over. Yet many who shrink from any particular issue of defense do not want to give up the independence of the non-Communist world. Most current critics are not pacifists, but they want *defense* without war, without even the possibility of atomic war. They want to mollify and to tame Red China without "appeasement." The Communist deeds and present policies in Korea and Vietnam are somehow discounted; the Chinese war against the United Nations is forgotten before it is ended. Yet this is the immediate background of the problem of Taiwan and the Straits.

It is easier to blame Eisenhower and Dulles for an intractable situation than to put forward alternative lines of policy which hold any real chance of achievement. Moreover, it is only fair for anxious critics, here or abroad, to admit their tendency to demand concessions from the United States rather than from the Communist powers, because the latter remain armored against public opinion and are secretive in their processes of decision.

With these preliminary cautions in mind, we are now free to complain much and to suggest a little to American leaders. First of all, do we take into account the way things look to Chinese on the mainland, sixty times as many in number as those on Taiwan? Quemoy is used to hamper and even to destroy shipping in a major port,

as well as to flaunt the Chiang idea of reconquering the country which he fled. If the offshore islands are important for the defense of Taiwan, they are far more important to the coast they closely mask. Viewed from the mainland, they are an intolerable provocation, which must soon draw a counter-challenge. Also, Chiang's air force, so obviously an American creation, insists on continuing its frequent flights over the coastal provinces. Some dark morning the Communists will insist on the converse, and that will be termed aggression.

Moreover, to Red China the United States is by now a perennial aggressor that has inserted its navy, air power, atomic weapons, and other large-scale factors (military, economic, and political aid to Taiwan) into Chinese affairs. Peking and Taipei seem to agree upon two propositions, if upon no other: (1) China is indivisible, claimed by each as against the other. (2) The Chiang regime depends upon the American alliance for survival. In this perspective, the American intervention is massive, protracted and notorious. Seen from the mainland, it is an act of war to be countered at the first expedient moment.

The problem of the future of Taiwan is difficult enough. But the commitment of Chiang's forces and morale, plus our significant, if ill-defined, commitment in aid and protection to an island lying under the full fire of thousands of shore guns, is militarily and politically preposterous.

Consideration for the needs and views of the Chinese now free of Communist rule there must be; and confidence is acutely important in East

Asia. But it is not sane for the United States to line up so fully with Chiang that his acts can determine the relations of the mainland to the United States, as well as to the United Nations, and can chart a course toward what might well become a world war. With whatever anguish to the responsible leaders in Taiwan, the Pentagon, the White House and the State Department, the present set-up must be radically reviewed.

We have no right to ask miracles of Eisenhower and Dulles. We must, however, press considerations like these: How and why has the island problem been allowed to worsen since 1955 when it last erupted in ominous warning? Why does Dulles dance back and forth between moral certainty in drawing a line where the Communists must stop or fight and the opposite uncertainty in keeping them guessing as to what we might do? Why do we utter forceful and rigid declarations of what must be, and follow them with hints of flexibility? When we sublimely affirm that nothing can be negotiated under forceful pressure, can we show that we have negotiated with any openness when there was no immediate threat of force, or that our recent pronouncements leave any room for prompt negotiation on important issues? How can Eisenhower and Dulles gain the nation's and the world's confidence that major policies and declarations of policy come from adequate consultation within this country and with competent representatives of other countries, confidence that their own concern for the peace and freedom of mankind is not corrupted by internal politics?

The Communist peril to the world is so great and the difficulties of negotiation are so vastly critical that we cannot afford drift, wrong moves or ill-considered words. Even the best that men can envision and do may not avail. Less than that best is what we have now, and it may appear in the Day of Judgment as colossal crime.

M. S. B.

A SOUND DECISION, DOUBTFULLY DEFENDED

THE CONTROVERSY over therapeutic use of birth control devices in New York City's municipal hospitals (see "Problems of the Pluralist Society," Sept. 15 issue) came to a head a few days later when the Board of Hospitals removed the

administrative ban against the practice. The decision was in line with official Protestant thinking, as well as with the trend in medical ethics and public opinion. But some of the Protestant statements issued in connection with this subject leave much to be desired.

There is nothing incongruous about the fact that in this instance an ecclesiastical judgment coincides with a scientific and professional judgment. From a religious viewpoint this means only that, in this particular instance, the medical people are judged to be morally right. But this is a far cry from the contention that *because* the doctors "approve" and "prescribe" a form of treatment no moral objection to it should be advanced.

Since when have the Protestant churches been content to allow legislatures and professional associations to hold their proxies when moral issues were at stake? Dismayed as non-Catholics are—this writer among them—at the inflexible and arbitrary position taken by Roman Catholic authorities on this public health issue, it cannot be denied that what they had to say about the Board's decision was much more relevant in *moral* terms than the Protestant statement, with its emphasis on "proper and accepted therapeutic practices." A major function of the Church is to bring under stern review what is "proper" and "accepted" in the secular order.

Particularly unfortunate was the initial uncertainty in the official Protestant group as to whether Catholic nurses, as well as Catholic physicians, should be allowed full freedom of conscience by the hospital administration with respect to their own participation in a birth control therapy forbidden by the Catholic Church. It is to the Protestant spokesmen's credit that they came out eventually at a classical Protestant position, taking a stand for freedom of conscience all around.

But the fact that they hesitated gives some ground for the fear that Protestant strategy is too often shaped vis-à-vis the Roman Church rather than in accord with the true Protestant ethos. Whenever that happens even the secular-minded observer will have less respect for it than for the ecclesiastical authority that is able and ready to say, as in this instance: "All Catholic personnel of our hospitals are reminded of their grave obligation in conscience to in no way cooperate with such procedure." It is more in character for a church to make judgments that most people will

believe to be wrong than to make pronouncements that are sure to appear irrelevant.

What was grievously disappointing in the position taken by the Catholic leaders in this case was the complete lack of that insightful wisdom that Catholic scholars are currently manifesting with respect to the role of religion in a pluralistic culture. It is, to be sure, wholly wrong to demand or to expect that a religious body will refrain from seeking to make an impact on the entire community with its own special witness. But it is of the essence of cultural pluralism that no one group shall insist on being the conscience of the whole community. This is, indeed, a prime condition of freedom in a pluralist society; it cannot be too strongly stated that the exercise of free religion applies to groups and institutions as well as to persons and that one aspect of it is to mold the public conscience. But such freedom can exist only in the absence of organized social and political pressures to force the public conscience into a private mold. Protestants have tried this with unhappy results.

F. E. J.

THE COMMUNIST MENACE— 1958 MODEL

NOT TOO MANY years ago the papers were full of charges that a great many Presbyterians, from Moderator John Mackay on down, were "Communist-sympathizers," "left-wingers," and all the other horrendous things people could be accused of being during the McCarthy Era. Protestant clergymen, such as Daniel Poling for example, accused the writers of the now-famous "Letter to Presbyterians" of having cribbed their material from Soviet documents. The "Letter to the Presbyterians" contained such "Communist-inspired" notions as the following:

- "(1) The Christian Church has a prophetic function to fulfill in every society and in every age.
- (2) The majesty of truth must be preserved at all times and at all costs.
- (3) God's sovereign rule is the controlling factor in history."

Fortunately, the content of the document and the known stature of the men responsible for its composition, made its detractors look silly, uninformed and hysterical.

Now another group of Presbyterians has been accused of having been "brainwashed" by "left-wingers and Communists." This time the men involved are the members of the Washburn Pres-

bytery of the Presbyterian Church, U.S. (i.e., the southern church). For what insidious Communist doctrine were these men so attacked? They were so attacked for suggesting that the Governor of their state open the public schools in conformity with the law of the land, rather than deprive high school-age children of the chance to get a public education. For this dangerous bit of undemocratic and obviously Soviet-inspired advice, the members of the Washburn Presbytery in Arkansas were branded as "Reds." The brander was none other than Orville Faubus, the Governor of the sovereign state of Arkansas.

It might seem that, considering the source of the denunciation, the best thing to do would be to laugh it off and simply comment that Governor Faubus is hardly in a position either to pose as an expert on the Christian gospel in the field of race relations, or to exhibit himself as a champion of democracy, since he has just wrested from his state legislature authoritative powers that must make a lot of petty dictators the world over squirm with envy.

But this kind of charge needs all the publicity it can get, for it effectively shows, as nothing else has so clearly shown, the kind of man with whom the nation has to deal. Governor Faubus' considered estimate of Presbyterian clergymen is that "a large number of ministers in the Presbyterian Church have been very effectively brainwashed," and that the brainwashing has been done by "left-wingers and Communists."

It seems clear that a man who will make this kind of wholesale attack on the integrity of the clergy of the southern Presbyterian Church has not only been guilty of astonishing slander and even more astonishing naïveté, but that he has quite incorrectly gauged the staying power of his opponent. The southern church will not take this kind of attack lying down, and whatever influence Governor Faubus may have among southern Presbyterians will be correspondingly weakened.

In a situation like this, to be called a "Communist" by such a man is a badge of honor for Washburn Presbytery, and it indicates that when men speak what they believe in the name of their faith, however much or little they may go against the accepted mores, other men will speak evil of them and revile them. We salute the members of the Washburn Presbytery and welcome them into the group of churchmen whom irresponsible critics have branded as "Communists" for the sin of trying to relate the gospel to the twentieth century.

R. M. B.

Disarmament and Nuclear Tests

JAY OREAR

AT THE END of World War II many scientists foresaw a danger point, several years into the future, that made it imperative to obtain international control in the short time still available. Unfortunately the world reached that point several years ago without an agreement on international control. Some of those scientists who foresaw the danger point and the consequent failure to meet it have become cynical and have essentially given up hope.

In this article I would like to point out that things are not yet quite so gloomy. It is true that we are in a world where, even if there were disarmament and inspection, it would still be possible for the United States, Great Britain and Russia to have large, hidden stockpiles of nuclear weapons that could escape detection. But I will, towards the end of this article, discuss a possible method for the detection of hidden stockpiles.

We are now facing an even more serious danger point, and if we don't act immediately matters will go from bad to worse. This new danger point will be reached when these nuclear stockpiles spread to other nations. I would guess that within the next ten years, nuclear weapons will have spread over all the earth, to France, China, Sweden, Germany, Italy, Israel and perhaps beyond. Our only hope is that substantial action in the area of world disarmament be taken soon.

These nations will not need fancy delivery systems that cost millions of dollars per missile. The smuggling of small-sized, megaton bombs to appropriate cities is a much cheaper and more certain delivery system. The new, revolutionary concept we must face is that, with the same amount of effort it used to take to blow up a few feet of railroad track, a modern day fifth columnist can blow up an entire city and contaminate several thousand square miles with lethal radiation. Thus all our old ideas of warfare, security, diplomacy, and even ideas like massive retaliation, are hopelessly obsolete. The sooner our leaders and people shake loose these old ideas and penetrate the thought barrier the better. An example of the type of ideas we must face is that the Algeria-of-the-future could demand independence by threatening to set off a hidden H-bomb in Paris.

At present the most suitable step appears to be

a cessation of nuclear testing with inspection. By definition, the first step should be the step that is most easily acceptable and the Soviet Union claims willingness to accept this step, including inspection. A possible indication of the Soviet sincerity on this is that the Russians have not yet claimed their right to resume testing again, in spite of the fact that since the day they unilaterally stopped testing we have set off over 30 nuclear explosions.* I am a poor person to judge Russian sincerity, but I do not understand why we don't at least call their bluff. If they do turn out to be sincere about this, everybody gains.

Ending the Tests—Pro and Con

But what do we lose in the event that Russia turns out to be insincere? Here there is a valid objection to a test-ban agreement: Russia would gain a little time in the testing race. Let us not, however, lose proper perspective; we are now about 100 tests ahead of the Russians. On the other hand, violation of such an agreement would adversely affect a main approach toward the goal of world communism as it would cost the Russians a serious loss of respect from the peoples of the world. It is the job of the politician to weigh these pros and cons. Perhaps the opening up of Russia to international inspectors is in itself worth the risk of possible Russian insincerity.

There is also the relevant question of whether Russia could continue her testing program and successfully escape detection by the inspectors. It is conceivable to me that Russia might be able to hide a small number of very small yield underground tests. But it would be risky and would severely hamper her testing program. Eventually such evasion would be detected.

In a study made by the Senate Subcommittee on Disarmament, some seismologists claimed to know how to detect very small underground tests, while other seismologists were uncertain. It was clear, however, that the larger the number of seismographic stations, the more foolproof will be the detection. Russia already has over 70 seismic stations that could be used in the monitoring system.

One argument frequently offered in favor of continuing tests is our supposed need for further development of small defensive and tactical nuclear

Mr. Orear is an atomic scientist who teaches at Cornell University. His articles have appeared in *Foreign Affairs* and the *Bulletin of Atomic Scientists*.

* In the intervening time since this article was written the Russians have revoked their original position.

weapons. However, it is clear that there is no military defense against the "suitcase delivery system." Furthermore I, and other scientists, can think of several "foolproof" ways of evading anti-missile missiles. By "foolproof" I mean that no one has ever been able to answer our propositions. As for tactical nuclear weapons, I pray that our leaders have enough sense not to be the first ones to use them in a "limited war." The enemy would be forced to retaliate with old-fashioned, bigger and dirtier nuclear weapons, and so on. As long as Russia remains uninterested in tactical weapons, I see no serious urgency in developing them on our side.

If the USSR attacked the West using conventional weapons and promised not to use nuclear weapons, I doubt if the President, in spite of our officially stated policy of massive retaliation, would order the use of nuclear weapons against Russian cities. To do so would be to sign the death warrants of most of his fellow Americans.

I deliberately have not made use of fall-out as a reason for a test ban. Most scientists feel this reason is overemphasized compared to the fact that a test-ban agreement can be a first step in preventing future nuclear wars, and that a test ban can, in the short run, put an end to the spreading of nuclear weapons to smaller nations. I would like to make one point, however, about the fall-out controversy, and it is that Dr. Edward Teller's estimates of the fall-out hazard are about the same as Dr. Linus Pauling's. Dr. Teller estimates an average of two days loss of life per person in the world due to the past tests (excluding the last 35 tests). This is a total loss of 20 million man-years. Note that this is the same loss of life as directly killing 700,000 people of an average age.

However, Dr. Teller, Dr. Willard F. Libby and Admiral Lewis Strauss never speak in terms of the total number of individuals affected. Instead they compare fall-out to other hazards such as natural radiation, radium on wrist watch dials, medical X-rays, cigarette smoking, etc., and correctly show that, so far, fall-out from testing is a much smaller hazard. It is interesting that, on this hazard scale, the American loss of life in World War I and also in the Korean War, is less than the American loss of life (in man-years) due to the fall-out from past tests. This is assuming that Dr. Teller's estimate is correct.

Finally, I wish to discuss what seems to be a very promising inspection technique that is capable of detecting hidden stockpiles, and even smuggled "suitcase bombs." This is the "Inspection by

the People" technique worked out in the recent Columbia University study entitled *Inspection for Disarmament* published by the Columbia University Press. Professor Seymour Melman, editor of the report, proposes that, as part of a disarmament agreement, the national governments officially urge or require their people to report violations (secret weapons manufacture, hidden stockpiles, etc.) directly to the international inspectorate. For example, it could be made the legal duty of Russian citizens to mail such reports to Box 1, Moscow. This one address could be kept free of censorship by use of test letters dropped in local mailboxes by the inspectors. The Russian leaders would periodically appeal to their people to report all possible violations.

The People Lead

One objection that was raised to this proposal was that very few citizens would be willing to report on their own people to an international organization. Rather than rely on speculation, the Columbia group interested George Gallup in conducting public opinion polls on this subject. Before the results were known, it was felt that if at least five per cent answered "Yes," this technique would have merit. The United States' results were as follows:

Question: If this inspection organization were set up, would you favor or oppose making it each person's *duty* to report any attempt to secretly make atom bombs, hydrogen bombs and missiles?

<i>Answers:</i> Favor	73%
Oppose	11%
No opinion and no answer	16%

Question: If you, yourself, knew that someone in the United States was attempting to secretly make forbidden weapons, would you report this to the office of the world-wide inspection organization in this country?

<i>Answers:</i> Yes	80%
No	6%
No opinion and no answer	14%

These results were quite a surprise to everyone concerned. They should put the "Inspection by the People" technique on a firm basis.

The book also mentions that the results indicate "that with respect to the value of peace, loyalty to mankind is a higher value than loyalty to nation." Perhaps the people of the world are years ahead of their leaders. If so, let us hope that the leaders catch up before it is too late.

CORRESPONDENCE

"A Quite Misleading Analogy"

TO THE EDITORS: In Wayne Cowan's thoughtful description of the birth control battle in New York City's public hospitals ("Problems of the Pluralist Society," Sept. 15)—now happily ended with victory for the advocates of permissive contraceptive practice—an analogy is drawn between those Protestants who "forced their view of the alcohol problem on the public domain in the form of prohibition" and the Catholic opponents of birth control. Both are condemned by inference for attempting to impose their moral code on the larger society.

Isn't it time to scotch this popular and quite misleading analogy? (The bingo-birth control analogy is just as bad.) The Protestant advocacy of prohibition, regardless of its merits, was based on free discussion by free men. The policy was adopted by free vote of an American majority after long discussion. There were no denominational compulsions about it. I know of no American church that attempted to coerce its members into a pro-prohibition vote by threat of theological penalties. I know of no American Protestant who was excommunicated for voting wet.

The Catholic policy on birth control has none of these ingredients of freedom. It has not been freely arrived at by American Catholics. Both the policy and the theological penalties accompanying the policy have been made in Rome by a celibate hierarchy which uses completely autocratic techniques for arriving at all policy decisions. No Catholic is allowed to vote against the Pope's moral judgment in the matter, e.g., by voting for permissive birth control in Massachusetts, without being branded a mortal sinner. As Father George Dunne admitted in a debate with me at the Harvard Law School in 1950, a Catholic who disagrees with the moral principles of the Pope on this question has only one choice: he may cease to be a Catholic.

The most that liberal, dissenting Catholics can do in such a situation—besides voting a clear majority against their priests in birth control opinion polls—is to oppose enforcement of the Catholic policy on non-Catholics at the present time for reasons of expediency. That is what *The Commonwealth* did recently in discussing the New York hospital situation, and we should be grateful for its courage, while noting that the editors saved their mortal souls by professing continued loyalty to papal principles. Cardinal Spellman's final thrust... to the effect that the purely permissive ruling of the New York Hospital Board signifies "a deterioration of moral life" and "perverts the nature and dignity of man," contains no hint of apology or retreat, no suggestion that the hierarchy will ever permit the decision on birth control policy to be altered by the American Catholic people.

The Cardinal, of course, is quite free in our

free society to continue his advocacy of an anti-freedom policy in the name of moral freedom. But there is no reason why non-Catholics should fail to be candid about his role in our society. Our blunders are made in America by free choice; his are made in Rome by fiat. There is, in this comparison, more than a difference in degree; there is also a difference in kind. And there is, under the circumstances, no reason for Protestant humility.

PAUL BLANSHARD
Thetford Center, Vt.

Another View of Catholic Religious Liberty

TO THE EDITORS: It impresses me that in his "argument from difference" in regard to Roman Catholic views on religious liberty ("A Protestant View of Roman Catholic Power—II," Sept. 15, p. 122), John Bennett overlooks some salient facts. He fails to mention that when the "American view" of Fr. Murray was being advanced against the traditional Catholic view of religious liberty as it was currently being advanced by the Spanish hierarchy, Cardinal Ottaviani's statement settling the issue was approved by the Pope as "unexceptionable." Nor does he mention that Cardinal Ottaviani, as secretary of the Supreme Congregation of the Holy Office, was perhaps the Pope's closest confidant.

Dr. Bennett does make vague mention of a speech in which the Pope, himself in vague language, seems to lend some approval to "the American view." If any such pronouncement exists, it must appear rather emaciated when contrasted with the overwhelming evidence of pronouncements on the other side.

While it is nice that Fr. Murray holds "liberal views," the fact is that they have never gained any official recognition at the Vatican. Unfortunately, Fr. Murray speaks for no one, not even himself. Authoritative teaching of the American hierarchy in regard to religious liberty, a teaching squarely in line with the Church's tradition, has been consistently presented by Fr. Francis J. Connell.

It seems curious, too, that Dr. Bennett should speak of "the influence of liberal democratic ideas [which] enables Catholics to avoid the civil intolerance that causes most anxiety among Protestants." He apparently wrote this at the very moment that New York was in an uproar over a sectarian medical code that the Roman Catholic Church had for years been imposing on public hospitals of that city.

C. STANLEY LOWELL, Associate Director
Protestants and Other Americans United
for Separation of Church and State
Washington, D.C.

Mr. Lowell's letter raises an important question. How influential in the Roman Catholic Church is the view of Fr. Murray that was outlined? (Continued on page 144.)



Saint Hereticus

Notes for the SS Squad

Sunday school manuals "for the new fall quarter" are now appearing, burgeoning not only with teaching suggestions and play-time activities, but also with comments for the teachers who have to cope with "difficult" pupils.

I humbly suggest that this isn't the heart of the problem at all. The real dilemma of the Sunday school is just the reverse: How to cope with the poor teacher. Herewith, therefore, a brief manual of arms for the SS Squad—the kids.

(1) **The attention-getter.** Nearly every class will have at least one teacher who wants attention and tries to dominate the group. Be sympathetic with him, and realize that he probably comes from a difficult home situation. Perhaps you can call on him during the week and come to understand his problem at its source. There comes a time, however, when you must let him know who's really in charge. Draw the line if he tries to get cheap laughs, as many teachers do, by the annoying habit of insisting upon the use of Christian names. You can be sure that he is insecure and is playing to the gallery if he persists in referring to Spike as "Frederick," or looks in the direction of Butch and calls "William."

(2) **The teacher-who-isn't-prepared** (sometimes referred to as **the-teacher-who-hasn't-done-his-assignment**). There will be days when you will enter the Sunday School classroom and discover that your teacher has not prepared. Here are some giveaway signs: feverish glances at the lesson manual as you enter (at about the next-to-last page); circles under the eyes; periodic yawning; an excessive amount of time spent on the preliminaries, such as taking attendance, distributing Bibles, inquiring about those who are absent; secret glances at his watch to see if the hour is up yet; and a suggestion offered rather vaguely, but at great length, that "pretty soon we ought to start thinking about the possibility of a Saturday hike when the weather begins to look good again." The clincher will be if he lets you *keep* talking about yesterday's football game and even joins in the discussion. (Rule One for SS teachers seems to be: "Interrupt all discussions of football with the words, 'All right, fellows, let's get down to business; come on, now, you can talk about football later.'")

The teacher must not, of course, be allowed to get away with faking maneuvers to cover up his unpreparedness. This would be detrimental to his Growth. The best way to teach him how costly unpreparedness can be is very simple: ask him, with relentless intensity, questions about the lesson. Glance at your manual (one page *beyond* where he had to stop when you came in the door) and ask, loudly so all can hear, "Sir, just who *was* Ahizah?" or "What does it mean here about the sin against the Holy Ghost?" Note carefully that the question must be what we call a "Content Question" and not a "Thought Question." Thought questions make it possible for the teacher to bluff by rambling (i.e., thinking). If the teacher fortifies his attempted response by a hasty glance at the manual, comment, when he finishes, "Oh, but it says all *that* in the manual."

(3) **The-teacher-who-breaks-up-fights.** Almost every Sunday School will have a teacher who seems to come there with the sole purpose of breaking up fights. Whenever a fight is in progress, you can be sure that he will be in the middle of it, trying to stop it. Now Sunday School fights are important. (Where can one better prepare for the church fights in which one will engage as an adult, than at Sunday School?) Therefore, it is best to try to interest the teacher in the very activity he is attempting to stifle, so that he can become part of the group rather than remaining an outsider. If, for example, the two or more contestants will forget about their animosities for one another long enough to team up against the interfering teacher, they will discover that sometimes the incurring of physical violence upon his person, perhaps in the neighborhood of the shin, can cause him to lose his temper and enter into the fray most uninhibitedly. Then what fun and games are in store for all!

Note: The principle here described can also be used for a variant of the above type, namely, **the-teacher-who-confiscates-pea-shooters**. However, if physical violence itself does not produce the desired end, try to interest the teacher in the educational values of the pea-shooter. What an exciting way, for example, to teach Palestinian geography: stand ten feet from a wall map, line everybody up, and see who can come closest to hitting Jerusalem smack in the middle. Best two out of three wins.

(4) **The-teacher-who-promises-a-Saturday-party-"if-you're-all-good."** This is the kind of last-ditch stand to which some teachers will resort in an effort to win popularity. It must not, of course, be tolerated, or the teacher will get the impression that he can "buy" your attention. The most common, though not necessarily the most kind, reprisal, is to be perfectly angelic during the trial period, and then (if I may use a theological expression) raise hell at the party.

This will put an end to all future bargaining and bartering for good conduct and leave the teacher squarely faced with the problem of making

the class interesting enough so that a certain amount of good conduct will result without your even being aware of it. Nothing worse for a teacher than letting you be aware that you're "being good." Brings original sin right to the surface.

CORRESPONDENCE

(Continued from page 142.)

lined in my article? I emphasized the fact that it is not the dominant view. It has the tradition of many centuries against it. The most that I can claim is that this issue of the religious liberty of non-Catholics in a nation in which there is a predominance of Catholics is being debated on all levels and in many countries, and that the traditional position is being challenged with great ability. The so-called "dynamic interpreters," to use the name given by Fr. Gustave Weigel to the Murray position, have strong support among Catholic scholars and laymen in this country and in several other democratic countries.

Prof. Kenneth Underwood, in Protestant and Catholic, points out that in Mt. Holyoke, Mass. 40 per cent of the clergy, and these the younger clergy, are receptive to this position (pp. 352-53). One difficulty is that, without raising the ultimate question of the theory of religious liberty, Catholics in this country can agree with the practical implications of Fr. Murray's position on pragmatic grounds. Members of the hierarchy do not want to be put on the spot on a matter that involves revision of basic theory. The discussion is being carried out by scholars and laymen.

The speech by Cardinal Ottaviani actually revealed the division within the Church because he was strongly attacked publicly by Catholic spokes-

man in this country, even by such a diocesan journal as *The Pilot* in Boston. I have learned by word of mouth about the serious divisions in the Vatican concerning this speech, but this quickly becomes gossip and it is hard to evaluate. The Pope's address to which I referred (distributed in English translation on Dec. 15, 1953) did not go further than the traditional position allows, but the timing of it suggests that he was in fact rebuking the extreme position advanced by Cardinal Ottaviani. The address itself shows the caution and even studied ambiguity that are common in papal utterances. The most that we can expect of the Pope on such matter is an indication of permissiveness. Remember that we are dealing here with a theoretical challenge of the traditional position; but this challenge has great significance because it fits the experience of Catholics in democratic countries. The Pope has elsewhere made a very clear place for democracy.

As far as birth control is concerned, I agree with those who fight uncompromisingly for the freedom of non-Catholics on this issue. There are important issues between Protestants and Catholics and I do not want to obscure them. Fortunately there is some disagreement among Catholics as to how far they should press their position on the whole community by law. There is a favorable straw in the wind in the fact that they are not attempting to have laws such as those in Massachusetts and Connecticut enacted in other states. But if this means that they are relying on administrative action, as was the case in New York City hospitals, they need to be resolutely opposed.

J. C. B.

Reprints: "Vignettes from Little Rock"

A limited number of reprints of the Sept. 29 issue containing the article, "Vignettes from Little Rock," are still available. Prices are: 1-49 copies at 20¢ each; 50-99 copies, 15¢ each; 100 or more at 10¢ each. Please include 15¢ postage for orders of 100 or more.

DETROIT PUBLIC LIBRARY
BOOK RECEIVING DEPT
5201 WOODWARD AVE
DETROIT 2 MICH

27462 11-66

CHRISTIANITY and CRISIS

A Christian Journal of Opinion
537 WEST 121 ST. • NEW YORK • N. Y.

EDITORIAL BOARD

REINHOLD NIEBUHR AND JOHN C. BENNETT, *Chairmen*
WAYNE H. COWAN, *Managing Editor*
ODESSA SOUTHERN ELLIOTT, *Assistant Editor*
M. SEARLE BATES WALDO BEACH AMOS WILDER
ROBERT McAFEE BROWN F. ERNEST JOHNSON
JOSEPH SITTLER HENRY P. VAN DUSEN
RICHARD T. BAKER J. OSCAR LEE
KENNETH W. THOMPSON WILLIAM LEE MILLER

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

HENRY SMITH LEIPER JOHN A. MACKAY
FRANCIS P. MILLER M. M. THOMAS
JOHN BAILLIE WILLIAM F. MAY ROGER L. SHINN
HERBERT BUTTERFIELD

CONTENTS

DISARMAMENT AND NUCLEAR TESTS

JAY OREAR